REMARKS

This is in response to the official action dated May 5, 2004. Reconsideration in view of the following is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the location and structure of the external component, and its interaction with punch. It is submitted that the amendment is fully supported in the specification and drawings and does not comprise new matter. Furthermore, the amendment does not add any new limitations, but rather relies on rewording of the description of the existing limitations to provide greater clarity. Claim 12 has been amended in similar fashion. In addition, the claim has been corrected to note that it is the dies that receive a rotational movement. This would be clear to one skilled in the art from reading the original claim.

Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-13 and 15 stand rejected as being obvious over Korsch in view of Link.

In characterizing Korsch, the examiner appears to have incorrectly identified the function and structure of some of the key elements. There is no connecting component located in a circumferential recess of the stem of the punches. In Korsch, the punches reside, locked against rotation, within a bushing. The connection is via a groove-and-tongue joint, for example. However, a circumferential recess connection would not be possible, since this would allow for rotation. In contrast, the applicant's punch is rotatably secured to the punch shaft.

In addition, the examiner states that the shell surface of the punch in Korsch comprises the 'first zone'. This is also not correct. The punch of Korsch is a simple punch, without any engaging means. Rather, it is the bushing of Korsch which has a serrated section.

PAGE 6/8 * RCVD AT 8/3/2004 3:45:44 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/0 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:2128080844 * DURATION (mm-ss):02-28

Link is cited simply for the proposition of substituting a removable punch and shaft arrangement for the punch arrangement of Korsch. First, Link is not a rotary press, but is a static press. The operation and concerns are distinct from those of rotary press design; and the skilled person in the rotary press art would not look to Link for solutions. Second, and perhaps more important, it is simply not possible to physically exchange the rotary punches of Link's static press into the rotary press of Korsch. Even if one were able to do this, we would still not arrive at the applicant's invention.

Korsch has an anti-rotation punch residing within a rotatable bushing. It is not seen how a rotatable punch residing on an anti-rotation shaft could be simply dropped into place in the Korsch device, or why there would be any motivation for such a substitution. It is noted that while Link shows a gear about the surface of the punch 2, this gear is not analogous to the serrations of either Korsch or the present invention. Rather, the gear meshes with an external motor drive gear for a continuous turning movement, not a locking movement, and this arrangement is inapplicable in the rotary press art.

It is an object of the present invention to provide a universal punch arrangement, which can work for both roll-guided and rotation-symmetrical presses (see page 2, last paragraph). It is noted that Korsch does not relate to a roll-guided press. In a roll-guided press, e.g. as shown in Fig. 2 of the present specification, there is *no direct* rotational force impacted upon the punch by the roll guides. The punch shaft must be anti-rotationally secured as it is acted upon by the roll guides 31, 32. In contrast, Korsch allows for rotational movement of the punch 19 (together with the bushing), as the punch 19 is acted upon *directly* by the cam 14. In this way, the punch 19 of Korsch is essentially a punch and shaft combined into a single element. To be effective in a roll-guided press, the shaft itself must be anti-rotationally secured. Accordingly, as Korsch relates to a non-roll-guided press, in which the shaft of the punch rotates with respect to the cam guide,

there is no motivation to provide an arrangement wherein the shaft of the stem is non-rotatable.

To summarize, there is no motivation to substitute the removable punch arrangement of Link, nor can such arrangement be physically substituted into Korsch. Furthermore, even if one were to somehow achieve this, Korsch itself does not teach important elements of the present invention, including providing an external component which engages the punch, which external component resides outside of the rotary circle of the punch. In addition, neither Link nor Korsch teach a locking engagement means (first zone) on the punch itself.

Therefore, none of the claims are obvious over the cited references. As to claim 5 and 14, Barna does not teach anything which would overcome the deficiencies of Korsch and Link as applied to claim 1.

Wherefore, allowance of all claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

NORRIS, McLAUGHLIN & MARCUS, P.A.

By _____
Bruce S. Londa
Reg. No. 33,531

220 East 42nd Street
30th Floor
New York, New York 10017
(212) 808-0700

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that the foregoing Amendment (8 pages total) is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on the date indicated below:

Date: 8/3/04

By _____
Tina Manor

PAGE 8/8 * RCVD AT 8/3/2004 3:45:44 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/0 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:2128080844 * DURATION (mm-ss):02-28